



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,596	07/08/2002	Hiroyuki Nakajima	1131-0463P	3711
2292	7590	06/14/2006	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				LEUNG, JENNIFER A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1764		

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/069,596	NAKAJIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer A. Leung	1764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3: Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 7, 2006 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment submitted on February 8, 2006 has been received and carefully considered. Claims 1-11 are cancelled. Claims 12-15 are active.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko et al. (EP 0 915 244) in view of Takahata et al. (US 5,376,610).

Regarding claim 12, Kaneko et al. discloses a catalytic apparatus comprising:
exhaust purification means 13 provided in the exhaust path and adapted to absorb NOx when an air-fuel ratio of incoming exhaust gas is a lean air-fuel ratio and to release or reduce the absorbed NOx when an oxygen concentration of the incoming exhaust gas lowers; and
a three-way catalyst 11 provided in the exhaust path, having a function of reducing HC in the exhaust gas, and located on an upstream side of said purification means 13, said three-way catalyst including a plurality of layers and containing a small amount of or no ceria (see, for

Art Unit: 1764

example, sections [0021], [0038]-[0039], [0145]).

The apparatus of Kaneko et al. is substantially the same as that of the instant claims, but is silent as to the specific components of each layer of the three-way catalyst as claimed.

However, Takahata et al. teaches the provision of a three-way catalyst for reducing HC in the exhaust gas, said three-way catalyst having an inner layer containing Rh in an amount of 1.5-10 g/ft³ mixed with other noble metals, such as Pt and Pd; and an outermost layer containing Pd or Pt in an amount of 5-60 g/ft³ (see Examples 1 and 7 of Takahata et al.; see also, generally, col. 4, lines 41-43; col. 5, lines 9-40; col. 7, lines 35-38, 58-65; col. 8, lines 5-10).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the three-way catalyst of Takahata et al. for the three-way catalyst of Kaneko et al. for the known and expected results of obtaining the same results thereof, and since such a modification would have involved a mere substitution of known equivalents. A substitution of known equivalent structures involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Regarding claims 13-15, the range of each component in the layers of the three-way catalyst of Takahata et al. encompasses the ranges recited in the instant claims.

4. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura et al. (US 6,463,734) in view of Kaneko et al. (EP 0 915 244) and Takahata et al. (US 5,376,610).

Regarding claim 12, Tamura et al. discloses a catalytic apparatus comprising:
exhaust purification means 13 provided in the exhaust path and adapted to absorb NOx when an air-fuel ratio of incoming exhaust gas is a lean air-fuel ratio and to release or reduce the

Art Unit: 1764

absorbed NO_x when an oxygen concentration of the incoming exhaust gas lowers; and a three-way catalyst 32 provided in the exhaust path, having a function of reducing HC in the exhaust gas, and located on an upstream side of said purification means 13, said three-way catalyst including Pt, Rh, etc. (col. 7, lines 58-67).

The apparatus of Tamura et al. is substantially the same as that of the instant claims, but is silent as to the specific components of each layer of the three-way catalyst as claimed.

However, Kaneko et al. teaches the provision of a three-way catalyst 11 located upstream of the exhaust purification means 13 and containing only a small amount or none of ceria so as to assure the improving durability of the exhaust purification means (col. 12, lines 40-48).

Takahata et al. teaches the provision of a three-way catalyst for reducing HC in the exhaust gas, said three-way catalyst having an inner layer containing Rh in an amount of 1.5-10 g/ft³ mixed with other noble metals, such as Pt and Pd; and an outermost layer containing Pd or Pt in an amount of 5-60 g/ft³ (see Examples 1 and 7 of Takahata et al.; see also, generally, col. 4, lines 41-43; col. 5, lines 9-40; col. 7, lines 35-38, 58-65; col. 8, lines 5-10).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the three-way catalyst of Takahata et al. with the amount of ceria as taught by Kaneko et al. for the three-way catalyst in the apparatus of Tamura et al., for the known and expected results of obtaining the same results thereof, and since such a modification would have involved a mere substitution of known equivalents. A substitution of known equivalent structures involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Regarding claims 13-15, the range of each component in the layers of the three-way catalyst of Takahata et al. encompasses the ranges recited in the instant claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 12-15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,734 to Tamura et al. in view of Kameko et al. (EP 0 915,244) and Takahata et al. (US 5,376,610).

The same comments with respect to Tamura et al., Kameko et al. and Takahata et al., from above, apply.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed February 8, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants (beginning at page 4 of the response) argue,

"Takahata teaches as follows:

In the first catalyst layer, there can be used, as the catalyst metal other than Rh, a noble metal such as Pt, Pd or the like as necessary. However, since Rh easily forms an alloy with Pt or Pd, causing catalyst deactivation, Rh and Pt or Pd are preferably arranged separated from each other. For example, Rh and Pt are loaded on respective substrates and then arranged in the form of a mixed catalyst layer; or a substrate containing Rh and a substrate containing Pt are arranged in layers.

Column 4, lines 36-44.

In contrast... Applicants do not separate rhodium and platinum in the catalyst layer in which they both are present..."

The Examiner respectfully maintains that the three-way catalyst composition of Takahata et al. meets the claims. Although an admixture of both Rh and Pt or Pd is nonpreferred since an alloy of the metals may form, disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). "A known or obvious composition does not become patentable simply because it has been described as somewhat inferior to some other product for the same use." *In re Gurley*, 27 F.3d 551, 554, 31 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1994). (The invention was directed to an epoxy impregnated fiber-reinforced printed circuit material. The applied prior art reference taught a printed circuit material similar to that of the claims but impregnated with polyester-imide resin instead of epoxy. The reference, however, disclosed that epoxy was known for this use, but that epoxy impregnated circuit boards have "relatively acceptable dimensional stability" and "some degree of flexibility," but are inferior to circuit boards impregnated with polyester-imide resins. The court upheld the rejection concluding that applicant's argument that the reference teaches away from using epoxy was insufficient to overcome the rejection since "Gurley asserted no discovery beyond what was known in the art." 27 F.3d at 554, 31 USPQ2d at

Art Unit: 1764

1132.). It is further noted that Takahata et al. specifically suggests examples wherein both rhodium and platinum or palladium are present as an "admixture" in the inner layer. For instance, Examples 1 and 7 (see column 14) illustrate three-way catalysts comprising an inner layer containing 35 g/ft³ of Pt and 5 g/ft³ of Rh formed on a honeycomb heater by method C, i.e., as an admixture (see column 13, lines 16-21).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer A. Leung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1449. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 5:30 pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn A. Calderola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer A. Leung
June 11, 2006 *jle*

Alexa Neckel
ALEXA DOROSHENK NECKEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER